NANGARHAR UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF ARTS & HUMANITIES
NUJAH
e-ISSN: 3106-4981 (Online)
Vol:1(02), Oct-Dec: 2025
Journal Homepage: https://nujah.org/en

Research Article

Exploring Teachers and Students' Perceptions on the Use of Humour and Its Role in English Language Teaching in Khurasan University of Afghanistan

Zabihullah Arab[1], Sardar Wali Israr [2], Hedayatullah Bawar [3], Javid Hameedi[4], Malang Momand[5]*

1,2,3,5 Department of English, Faculty of Literature and Human Science, Laghman University, Mihtarlam, Afghanistan.

4 Department of Pashto, Faculty of Literature and Human Science, Laghman University, Mihtarlam, Afghanistan.

ARTICLE INFO

DATES
01-03-2026
03-04-2026

CITE THIS ARTICLE: *Exploring Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on the Use of Humor and Its Role in English Language Teaching in Khurasan University of Afghanistan. (2026). Nangarhar University Journal of Arts and Humanities, 1(02), 19-28. https://doi.org/10.70436/nujah.v1i02.14*

ABSTRACT

Humor's use and its role in ELT have been an important consideration for researchers in the current scope of teaching English as a foreign language. Since the current study is a comparative one, the research study aimed to survey the perceptions of ELT teachers and students at Khurasan University, Afghanistan, towards the use of humor and its role in ELT classrooms and determine whether or not they favor its use. The study also investigated the existing literature to determine the use and role of humor in the field of ELT. Thus, for the sake of data collection, the primary data of the study came from a five-point Likert-scaled questionnaire (developed after an extensive review of literature and adaptation) completed by 10 teachers and 50 students of the English Department of Khurasan University. The statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used to examine the data that the researcher gathered via questionnaires, with a focus on the use of percentages, means, and standard deviations. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. This helped the researcher to determine the mean and standard deviation of the corresponding questions. Consequently, the results of the study showed that humor is an effective strategy for helping students deal with stress, anxiety, and increase overall willingness to learn. Humor can also assist in improving the spirits, particularly for people who are self-conscious about their communication abilities or fear making mistakes.

KEYWORDS: *Humor, ELT, Teachers & Students Perceptions.*

Introduction

The English language has been given great value for the last two decades in Afghanistan. Thus, the mastery of English language skills is necessary for succeeding in personal, professional, and academic life (Ali, Iqbal, Din, Ali, & Rahman, 2015). Currently, the English language is important in Afghanistan for getting jobs and higher education. The English language is taught as a foreign language in government and private education institutions in Afghanistan, and in these institutions the teaching approach is classical. Complete silence is preferred with no humor, especially when the class is teacher-centered and the Grammar-Translation method is used.

According to Baid and Lambert (2010), such an atmosphere in the class is not at all advantageous to learning. Furthermore, when delivering dry and uninteresting information to students, their needs and motivation are not taken into account. Well, humor can have a direct effect on learning and information retention and an indirect effect on the atmosphere of the class in terms of its affective nature on learning (Ali, Iqbal, Din, Ali, & Rahman, 2015).

*Corresponding Author: (Arab Z)
Email: zabihullah_arab@yahoo.com

https://doi.org/10.70436/nujah.v1i02.14

© 2024 The Authors. Published by Nangarhar University, this is an open access article published under the CC-BY license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

According to Berk (2000), a good teacher should have many crucial factors that can lead them to be effective in their teaching. They are an exception due to their ability to use humor in the teaching and learning process. Moreover, one can easily say that humorous teachers are favored by students, whereas less humorous ones are less favored. On the other hand, using humor in ELT classrooms among scholars and educationists is debatable, and many researchers have tried to figure out ways to facilitate and encourage English language learning and teaching. It is perhaps no surprise that a better understanding of humor and its role(s) in teaching English will lead to fruitful outcomes. Many studies (Stroud, 2013; Zebila, 2012; Berk, 2002; Galindo, 2012; and Morreall, 2014) have found that incorporating humor into ELT classrooms can help students relax, reduce anxiety and boredom, create a joyful classroom environment, and establish rapport with their teachers. In short, humor can affect one's social, professional, and academic life. When humor is used in the English language classroom, it can affect the students' learning.

Literature Review

According to Furgoon (2017), in addition to digital skills, teachers' ability to use humor is an important consideration in the ELT classroom in the twenty-first century. Indeed, the effective integration of humor in classroom instruction is another significant skill. Thus, teachers need to develop. Today, the use of humor in the classroom has become a topic of critical discourse among researchers and educators.

Stroud (2013), for example, reported both the potential benefits (reducing anxiety, improving retention, participation, and engagement in learning, and creating a more relaxed and tension-free classroom atmosphere) and problems (teachers' disapproval of humor, a lack of discipline and seriousness, and students' target language difficulties in humor usage) of humor in the teaching process.

Humor in general education can not only amuse but has also been connected to a slew of possible educational advantages (Berk 2000; Wanzer, Frymier, & Irwin 2010; Lovorn & Holaway 2015; Mantooth 2010). For example, humor can pave the ground for a positive atmosphere in classrooms, clear the air of boredom, and make learning more comfortable and cozy. Indeed, Wanzer et al. (2010) created the instructional humor processing theory (IHPT) on the basis of the incongruity theory.

The IHPT claims that humor can pave the way for learning. In addition, the IHPT can increase learners' attention. Moreover, according to Askildson (2005), using humor as a pedagogical tool was considered a significant determinant of both students' and teachers' language learning processes. Many psychological studies have found that teacher-led play can reduce language anxiety and increase learner engagement in the learning process. Moreover, it is stated that humor can be a "safe house" for language learning (Pomerantz & Bell, 2011).

When it comes to teaching and learning, humor may be beneficial (Berk, 2002; Galindo, 2012; and Morreall, 2014). For example, according to Zebila (2012), reduced tension, improved understanding of the subject, and increased class participation are just a few of the advantages. Similarly, a humorously delivered piece of information can be retained for longer.

Embalzado and Sajmpun (2020) stated that humor is considered "as a serious business" (p.17) due to the challenges on how it is dealt with. They also stated that humor is one of the strategies used for effective teaching and learning of the ELT classroom. Furthermore, some studies revealed that there was no difference between the participants' gender (Baleghizadeh & Ghoreishi, 2014; Ziyaeemehr & Kumar, 2014), age (Andarab & Mutlu, 2019), ethnicity (Ziyaeemehr & Kumar, 2014), an education level (Andarab & Mutlu, 2019; Ziyaeemehr & Kumar, 2014), and their judgment of humor (Baleghizadeh & Ghoreishi, 2014). According to Andarab and Mutlu (2019), there was no difference between male and female instructors considering their embracing of humor styles in the classroom.

Despite the pedagogical potentials of humor, there is still a question in using humor. Whether or not you find humor amusing is a matter of opinion. For example, what is taken into account many factors, such as bad delivery or a listener's lack of contextual comprehension, can prevent humor from eliciting a smile or laugh. Moreover, based on individual perception there are some senses of humor that cannot appreciate much.

For example, Shibinski and Martin (2010) stated that poisonous humor caused a rift in the relationship between professors and students, causing pupils to be unwilling or afraid to participate in the learning process, as well as a lack of concentration in class, whereas promoting humor led to attention, ease, and tranquility.

In addition, according to Gruner (2000) and McGhee (2014), in the learning process, the use of sarcastic humor is not considered well. Some studies, such as Bruner's (2002), identified humiliation, sarcasm, and ridicule as types of banned humor. In the Afghan context, not much attention has been focused on the implications of humor in ELT classrooms. Thus, this study is conducted to investigate teachers' and students' perspectives on the use and role of humor in English language teaching, particularly at the Department of English, Khurasan University, Afghanistan.

Moreover, since humor is subjective (Lovorn & Holaway, 2015; Meyer, 2000), this is studied in a situational context. The goal of this research is to learn the ways and manners in which humor is used in English language classes. A comprehensive review of the existing literature concerning the role of humor and the use of humor throughout English language teaching and learning is required to accomplish this.

Material and Methods

The current study is a comparative study that compares students' and teachers' perceptions of the use of humor and its role in English language teaching at Khurasan University in Afghanistan's Department of English. As a result, the researcher distributed the five-point Likert scaled questionnaire to 10 teachers and 50 students from Khurasan University's Department of English for data collection.

Results

Table 1 Summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 01 for both teachers and students.

Table 1: Question 01			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.0000	.66667	4.1000	1.29756

Question 01 evaluates a teacher's effectiveness. From the teacher's point of view, the mean value of teacher effectiveness is 4.00, while from the student's point of view, the mean value of effectiveness is 4.10. This implies that students believe that teachers' effectiveness is greater than their own value of teacher effectiveness, which is 4.00, while from the students' point of view, the mean value of teacher effectiveness is 4.10. This implies that students believe that teachers' effectiveness is greater than their own. As a result, teachers have a high level of effectiveness. The standard deviation of teacher effectiveness is 0.666, whereas the standard deviation of student effectiveness is 1.297. Turning toward the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is well evident that the difference in mean values between teachers and students is 0.10. This implies that the mean value of students' responses is greater than the mean value of teachers' responses. This claim asserts that students believe teachers are more effective than teachers believe.

Table 2 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 02 for both teachers and students.

Table 2: Question 02			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.0000	.66667	2.0200	.51468

Question 02 assesses a teacher's average use of humor during each class session. The mean value of a teacher's average use is 4.00 from the teacher's perspective, while the mean value of a student's average use is 2.02 from the student's perspective. This implies that students believe that teachers do not use humor frequently during each session. On the other hand, according to the teachers, they use a lot of humor during each session. Thus, the standard deviation of the average use of humor by teachers is 0.666, whereas it is 0.514 from the perspective of students. In fact, the average use of humor during each session is higher than the students' expectations. In short, it shows that teachers should try to use a bit more humor in ELT classrooms while they are teaching. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 1.98 between the two groups. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is higher than the mean value of the student response. According to students' claims, teachers don't utilize humor as much as they think they do.

Table 3 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 03 for both teachers and students.

Table 3: Question 03			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
2.1000	.31623	3.2800	1.34073
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 03 assesses the degree of relevance of humor to classroom subject matter. From the teacher's perspective, the mean value of a teacher's humor's relevancy degree with classroom subject matter is 2.10, while from the student's perspective; the mean value of humor's relevancy degree with classroom subject matter is 3.28. This indicates that students believe their teachers use humor, most of which is related to the classroom subject matter. On the other hand, according to the teachers, they use humor about half the time when discussing classroom topics. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.316, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.340.

Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 1.18 between the two groups. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is lower than the mean value of the student response. According to students' claims, teachers use humor according to classroom subject matter, whereas teachers have the perception of using less humor regarding classroom subject matter.

Table 4 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 04 for both teachers and students.

Table 4: Question 04			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
2.1000	.31623	3.6200	1.38343
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 04 assesses the level of relaxation caused by humor in the language classroom. From the perspective of the teachers, the mean value of a teacher's humor's relaxation degree in a language classroom is 2.10, while from the perspective of the students, the mean value of humor's relaxation degree in a language classroom is 3.62. This indicates that students believe their teachers use humor to relax them, and as a result, they are considerably relaxed. On the other hand, according to the teachers, they use humor, but the students are noticeably relaxed. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.316, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.383. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 1.52 between the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding relaxation caused by humor in the language classrooms. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is lower than the mean value of the student response. According to students' claims, teachers' "use of humor" caused them more relaxation, whereas teachers have the perception of less relaxation in the language classrooms.

Table 5 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 05 for both teachers and students.

Table 5: Question 05			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
3.9000	.87560	3.5400	1.52810
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 05 assesses the level of interest in learning a language. From the perspective of the teachers, the mean value of a teacher's degree of interest in learning languages is 3.9, while from the perspective of the students, the mean value of their degree of interest in learning languages is 3.54. This demonstrates that students believe teachers use humor, which significantly increases students' interest in learning language. On the other hand, from the teachers' point of view, they use humor to significantly increase students' interest in learning languages. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.875, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.528. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.36 between the perception of both teachers and students regarding interest in learning languages. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's

response is higher than the mean value of the student response. Teachers claim that their "use of humor" increased students' interest in learning languages, whereas students believe they have less interest in learning languages.

Table 6 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 06 for both teachers and students.

Table 6: Question 06			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.1000	.56765	3.7200	1.27839
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 06 assesses the level of closeness in the class. From the teachers' perspective, the mean value of their degree of closeness in the class is 4.10, while from the students' perspective; the mean value of their degree of closeness in the class is 3.72. This suggests that students believe teachers use humor to make them more approachable in the classroom. On the other hand, from the teachers' point of view, they use humor, but in a much more approachable way in the classrooms. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.567, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.278. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.38 between the perception of both teachers and students regarding closeness in the class. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is higher than the mean value of the student response. According to teachers' claims, teachers' "use of humor" caused more closeness in the class, whereas students have the perception of less closeness in the class.

Table 7 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 07 for both teachers and students.

Table 7: Question 07			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.1000	.87560	3.8800	1.15423
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 07 assesses the degree of improvement in learning ability in a conducive environment throughout the class. The mean value of the teachers' improvement degree of learning ability in a conducive environment throughout the class is 4.10, while the mean value of the students' improvement degree of learning ability in a conducive environment throughout the class is 3.88. This indicates that students believe teachers use humor to improve the classroom environment. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that using humor in the classroom has resulted in significant improvements. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.875, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.154. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.22 between the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding improvement in learning ability in a conducive environment throughout the class. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is higher than the mean value of the student response. According to teachers' claims, humor use can cause improvements in learning ability in a conducive environment throughout the class, whereas students have the perception of less improvement in the class.

Table 8 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 08 for both teachers and students.

Table 8: Question 08			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
2.3000	.67495	2.5800	.60911
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 08 assesses the frequency of using humor or hilarious examples to illustrate linguistic aspects. From the teachers' perspective, the mean frequency of using humor or hilarious examples in the classroom is 2.30, while from the students' perspective; the mean frequency of humor or hilarious examples in the classroom is 2.58. This implies that students believe that teachers use humor on a regular basis. On the other hand, from the teachers' point of view, they use humor and demonstrate a high level of competence. As a result, the standard deviation is 0.674 from the perspective of teachers and

0.609 from the perspective of students. Regarding the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.28 between the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding the actual words or other elements of a humorous example used in the classroom. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is lower than the mean value of the student's response. According to students' claims, teachers use actual words or other elements of a humorous example throughout the class, whereas teachers have the perception of using less humor in the class.

Table 9 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 09 for both teachers and students.

Table 9: Question 09			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.4000	.69921	4.1600	1.07590
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 09 assesses the degree to which illustrative humor aids in foreign language learning. From the teachers' perspective, the mean value of illustrative humor's degree of helping in foreign language learning is 4.40, while from the students' perspective; the mean value of illustrative humor's degree of helping in foreign language learning is 4.16. This demonstrates that students believe teachers use humor and that the helping degree is noticeably high. On the other hand, from the teachers' point of view, they use humor and demonstrate a significantly higher level of assistance. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.699, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 1.075. When the mean values of teachers and students are compared, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.24 between their perceptions of how illustrative humor aids in foreign language learning.
According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is higher than the mean value of the student's response their perceptions of how illustrative humor aids in foreign language learning. According to this, the mean value of the teacher's response is higher than the mean value of the student's response. According to teachers, illustrative humor can aid in foreign language learning, whereas students believe it is less useful in class.

Table 10 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 10 for both teachers and students.

Table 10: Question 10			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
2.1000	.31623	2.1800	.43753
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 10 is about determining the optimal amount of humor for a typical class period in order to create a conducive learning environment. The mean value of teachers' ideal amount of humor for a typical class period for creating a conducive environment for learning is 2.10 from the teachers' perspective, while the mean value of students' ideal amount of humor for a typical class period for creating a conducive environment for learning is 2.18 from the students' perspective. This indicates that students believe teachers should use humor more than 1-3 times per class. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that they use humor extensively. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.316, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 0.437. According to the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.08 between the perceptions of both teachers and students regarding the optimal amount of humor for a typical class period in order to create a conducive learning environment. According to this, the mean value of the student's response is higher than the mean value of the teacher's response. According to students' claims, the optimal amount of humor is around 1-3 times; likewise, teachers have the same sensation about the optimal amount of humor in the class.

Table 11 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 11 for both teachers and students.

Table 11: Question 11			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
4.5000	.52705	4.2800	.83397
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 11 assesses the significance of humor in language learning. The mean value of the teachers' population is 4.50, while the mean value of the students' population is 4.28.

This demonstrates that students believe teachers should use humor more in the classroom. Teachers, on the other hand, believe that they make extensive use of humor. As a result, the standard deviation according to teachers is 0.527, while the standard deviation according to students is 0.833. Turning to the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.22 between the perception of both teachers and students regarding the significance of humor in language learning. According to this, the mean value of the teachers' response is higher than the mean value of the students' response. According to teachers' claims, humor is so significant for language learning; likewise, students have the same sensation about the importance of humor in language learning.

Table 12 summarizes the Std. Deviation of question 12 for both teachers and students.

Table 12: Question 12			
Teachers		Students	
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
2.2000	.42164	2.3400	.65807
Source: SPSS Output			

Question 12 assesses the average use of humor in the language learning classroom. From the perspective of the teachers, the mean value of the population is 2.20, while from the perspective of the students, the mean value is 2.34. This demonstrates that students use humor in their foreign language classes. Furthermore, teachers confirmed that students use humor to communicate in a foreign language. As a result, the standard deviation from the perspective of teachers is 0.421, while the standard deviation from the perspective of students is 0.658. Turning to the comparison of mean values between teachers and students, it is clear that there is a difference of 0.14 between the perception of both teachers and students regarding the average use of humor in the language learning classroom. According to this, the mean value of the teachers' response is lower than the mean value of the students' response. According to students' claims, the average use of humor should increase in the language learning classroom; likewise, teachers have the same sensation about the average use of humor in the language learning classroom.

Discussion

Investigating how instructors and students at Khurasan University in Afghanistan view the usage and role of humor in English Language Teaching (ELT) classes was the goal of this study. The results present a complex representation, showing both broad agreement with the theoretical benefits of humor and a notable discrepancy between its perceived use and actual results. These important findings are summarized, interpreted within the unique cultural and educational context of Afghanistan, and compared to the body of current international research in this discussion.

1. The Unquestioned Value of Humor in ELT

The most basic and constant observation between the two groups is the strong, mutual conviction on the value of humor as a teaching technique. Both teachers (M=4.50) and students (M=4.28) strongly concur that humor plays a key role in language learning, as seen by the high mean scores for Question 11. This is entirely consistent with the qualitative findings from the surveys, which revealed that humor is a "powerful tool" for lowering anxiety and fostering a supportive learning atmosphere. This agreement firmly backs up the claims made by academics such as Deiter (2000), who recognized humor as a powerful motivator that can increase self-esteem, lower anxiety, and improve relationships between students and teachers. The general consensus regarding the importance of humor in the high-stakes, frequently stressful context of learning a foreign language places it not as a pointless extra but rather as a crucial element of successful teaching at Khurasan University.

2. The Perception Gap: Aspiration vs. Reality

The study finds a significant and persistent disparity between teacher and student perceptions of humor's practical application—a gap between aspiration and reality—despite this theoretical agreement.

- Frequency of Use: The perceived frequency of humor use (Question 02) shows the most pronounced disparity. While students thought the frequency was much lower (M=2.02), teachers reported a high frequency (M=4.00). This implies

that what educators view as adequate or obvious humor does not correspond with what students anticipate or believe. This can be the result of cultural variances in the definition of humor, a timing or delivery error, or just teachers exaggerating how much humor they utilize.

- Impact and Outcomes: A recurring trend showed that teachers thought their use of humor produced more favorable results (interest, intimacy, and learning progress) than students thought (Q05, Q06, Q07, Q09). This suggests that even while educators are hopeful about the results of their tactics, the student body may not completely understand or be informed of these results. Although they accept the advantages, students' evaluations are more moderate.

The most important contribution of this study is this perceptual gap. It implies that students at Khurasan University have an unfulfilled need for more humor—possibly with greater effectiveness. Although humor is valued by teachers, they may need to consider and modify their methods to make sure their goals are met by the students.

3. Humor as an Antidote to Anxiety

The results provide compelling evidence for humor's ability to reduce the affective filters that impede language acquisition. Even more than teachers expect (M=2.10), the results for Question 04 demonstrate that humor significantly relaxes kids (M=3.62). The study's hypothesis and the participants' own remarks that humor "lightens the mood" for people who are self-conscious or afraid of making mistakes are directly supported by this. Humor supports Deiter's (2000) theory that it can boost students' confidence and lower anxiety by creating a fun and laid-back atmosphere, which in turn makes them more willing to take the risks required for language practice.

4. Cultural Context and Pedagogical Implications

The study was carried out inside the particular cultural framework of higher education in Afghanistan. The fact that both educators and learners in this context highly support a teaching approach that fosters happiness and lowers worry is very remarkable. It disproves any possible notion that these approaches are less useful or successful in this situation. On the contrary, it implies that everyone needs a nurturing and encouraging learning environment. According to the findings, Afghan pupils are quite open to instructional strategies that shift away from strict, traditional methods and toward more democratic, humanistic classrooms.

5. Alignment with Existing Literature

The study's findings generally align with the global corpus of research on humor in education, especially in ESL/EFL settings. Deiter's (2000) work is clearly supported by the results, which show how humor is thought to inspire students, boost self-esteem, and foster a laid-back atmosphere.

By emphasizing the perception gap between teachers and students—a subtlety that is essential for teacher preparation and professional development—this study contributes a significant dimension to the body of literature.

Summary and Recommendations

According to the study's findings, humor is regarded as an essential and practical instrument for Khurasan University's English language instruction and learning, not only a decorative element. A classroom where humor is used to reduce stress, encourage participation, and speed up learning is something that both instructors and students strive for.
The wide disparity in opinions on the prevalence and significance of comedy, however, suggests room for improvement. In order to close this gap, the following suggestions are put forth:

1. Professional Development: Workshops at universities should be held to teach instructors useful techniques for incorporating humor into their teachings that are both relevant and culturally appropriate. Quality and perceptibility, not merely intention, should be the main focus here.
2. Conscious Practice: In order to reach the "1-3 times per class" standard that both groups decided upon, teachers are urged to intentionally and actively utilize humor more (Q10). Using humorous examples, anecdotes, puns, or drawings that are relevant to the instructional content could be one way to do this.
3. Student Feedback: Teachers should question students informally about their impressions of the classroom environment, specifically whether comedy works well and how it could be made better.
4. Further Research: In addition to the teacher and student self-reports, a follow-up study that uses classroom observations could provide objective data on the type and frequency of humor utilized, providing a third viewpoint.

Educators at Khurasan University may better utilize humor to make language learning more engaging, successful, and pleasurable for their students by proactively addressing this perceived gap.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to find out how teachers and students feel about the use and role of humor in English language teaching at Khurasan University of Afghanistan. Overall, humor is considered a good tool for teaching and learning English, and the use and role of humor in English language teaching at Khurasan University of Afghanistan. Overall, humor is considered a good tool for teaching and learning English because, in the questionnaires, many teachers and students elaborated on their desired perceptions about the use and role of humor in ELT classroom settings. From the data, it was also figured out that, beside other skills, a teacher should have the skill of using humor in his or her teaching because many students and teachers said that humor integration is, to some extent, a must in the learning and teaching process. For example, humor is a powerful tool for assisting learners in overcoming anxiety and tension and increasing their openness to learning. Humor could also assist in lightening the mood, especially for those who are self-conscious about their communication skills or fear making mistakes.

Similar research has been conducted, and the outcomes are similar to my outcomes. For example, Deiter (2000), stated that humor has the potential to motivate students in a variety of ways. It could, for example, boost their confidence, aid with memorizing, reduce anxiety, enhance attendance, increase engagement, build curiosity, create a relaxed environment, instill enthusiasm, and strengthen teacher-student bonds. This is critical because, as teachers, we teach our students to smile at mistakes rather than at those who make them. Among the most sincere and common speaking behaviors in human communication is humor. Humor can be used effectively to educate second or foreign languages, which benefits both teachers and students. When used skillfully by a language instructor, humor may be a strong technique for improving language instructional practices. A further incentive for learners to attend classes could come from the use of humor.

References

Ali, S.S., Iqbal, M., Din, R., Ali, A. & Rahman, G. (2015). Appropriate use of humor in English Language Teaching: A case study of KUST. *Abasyn Journal of Social Science, 8*(1), 127-142

Andarab, M. S., & Mutlu, A. (2019). Using humor in language classrooms: Greasing the wheels or putting a spanner in the works? A study on humor styles of Turkish EFL instructors. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 23-39. doi:10.32601/ejal.543776

Askildson, L. (2005). 'Effects of humor in the language classroom: Humor as a Pedagogical tool in theory and practice'. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT* vol.*12* (1), pp. 45–61.

Baid, H., & Lambert, N. (2010). Enjoyable learning: The role of humor, games, and fun Activities In nursing and midwifery education. *Nurse Education Today, 30*(6), 548-552. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2009.11.007

Baleghizadeh, S., & Ghoreishi, A. (2014*).* An evaluation of the use of humor in ELT course books. *International Journal of Languages and Literatures*, *2*(2), 187-201.

Berk, R. (2000). 'Does humor in course tests reduce anxiety and improve performance?' *College Teaching 48 (4)*, pp. 151–159.

Bruner, R. F. (2002). Transforming thought: The role of humor in teaching. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=298761

Deiter, R. (2000). The use of humor as a teaching tool in the college classroom. *NACTA Journal, 44*(2), 20-27.

Embalzado, H., & Sajampun, P. (2020). Perspectives of students in Thailand on the use of humor in the university classroom. *International Education Studies*, *13*(4), 17-26. doi:10.5539/ies.v13n4p17.

Furgoon, M.M.A. (2017). The Integration of Humor in ELT Classroom Instruction: Solutions to the Barriers. The State University of Malang, National Seminar Proceeding p.357.

Galindo, F. A. (2012). The Use of Humor in the Classroom: Exploring Effects on Teacher-Student Immediacy and Student Learning. The University Of Texas at El Paso.

Gruner, C. R. (2000). *The game of humor: A comprehensive theory of why we laugh.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Lovorn, M., & Holaway, C. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of humor as a classroom teaching, interaction, and management tool. *The European Journal of Humor Research, 3*(4), 24-35.

Mantooth, J. D. (2010). The effects of professor humor on college students' attention and retention. Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.

McGhee, P. E. (2014). Toward the integration of entertainment and educational functions of television: The role of humor. In The entertainment functions of television (pp. 193–218). Psychology Press.

Meyer, J. C. (2000). Humor as a Double-Edged Sword: Four Functions of Humor in Communication. *Communication Theory, 10*(3), 310-331. doi:10.1111/j.1468- 2885.2000.tb00194.x

Morreall, J. (2014). Humor, philosophy, and education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 46*(2), 120–131.

Pomerantz, A. & Bell, N. D. (2011). 'Humor as a safe house in the foreign language classroom'. *The Modern Language Journal 95* (1), pp. 148–161.

Shibinski, K., & Martin, M. (2010). The role of humor in enhancing the classroom climate. *Athletic Therapy Today, 15*(5), 27-29.

Stroud, Robert. (2013). The Laughing EFL Classroom: Potential Benefits and Barriers. *English Language Teaching. 6*(1), 72-85. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n10p72.

Wanzer, M., Frymier, A. B., & Irwin, J. (2010). An Explanation of the Relationship between Instructor Humor and Student Learning: Instructional Humor Processing Theory. *Communication Education, 59* (1),1-18. doi:10.1080/03634520903367238.

Zebila, M. (2012). Using Humor as a Pedagogical Strategy to Reduce Students' Boredom: The Case of First-Year Students of English at Biskra.

Ziyaeemehr, A., & Kumar, V. (2014). *The relationship between instructor humor orientation and students' report on second language learning.* International Journal of Instruction, 7(1), 91-106.